



MARYLAND GREEN BUILDING COUNCIL
MEETING SUMMARY
LOWE HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING ROOM 218
23 APRIL 2014

Attendees:

Tom Liebel – MDGC
Stephen Gilliss – DGS
Mark Beck - USM
David Lever PSCP
Lisa Ferretto - MDGBC
Soren Graae – DBM
Mimi Wright - MDGBC
Lauren Buckler - DGS

Kristen Ahearn - MEA
Anne Raines - MDP
Meg Andrews – DOT
Prescott Gaylord – MDGBC
Christine Varney – MDGBC
David St. Jean – MEA
Joan Cadden - DGS
Ellen Robertson DGS

Guests:

Tonya Zimmerman – DLS
Crystal Lemieux - DLS
Chris Parts - AIAMD
Lorraine Doo- USGBCMD

I. Chairman Tom Liebel brought the meeting to order. Introductions of all attendees followed.

II. The meeting summary from the March meeting was released yesterday so there has not been enough time to receive and incorporate corrections. A vote to approve the summary will have to wait until the next meeting.

III. Started looking at the High Performance Green Building Program to upgrade to accommodate LEED V4 and IgCC.

A. Leading the discussion Tom Liebel focused on the first page mission and purpose statements for the Council.

1. He asked how we are doing on energy in the State. Lauren Buckler stated that we are on target for the 15% reduction by 2015 as stated here. 20% by 2020 has been discussed but is not enacted at this time. The 20% reduction would be from 2008. DGS has started working with agencies on energy plans. We currently have at least 21 energy performance contracts and are looking for more.
2. Tom asked if we are trying to present these. Lauren noted that DGS has graphics on the energy website and during session held the Energy Cup which the Governor attended and awarded prizes. DHMH won with a 20-30% reduction due to lots of EP contracts. SHA had the largest electricity reduction with lots of lighting changes. Corrections had the largest total energy reduction with more EPCs and the Military Department had the best data.

3. David St. Jean noted that power/energy has two goals...demand vs. consumption. Recommended changing the word in the document from demand to consumption.
- B. Tom then referred to the statement on fiscal responsibility and asked if we have gotten beyond the economic argument and should focus on other goals?
 1. David Lever said that he would like to see health mentioned. Tom agreed that the evidence is out there and asked if schools should also be mentioned here.
 2. Prescott Gaylord thought storm water should be mentioned. Mimi suggested water conservation be listed. Tom agreed both should be included.
- C. Stephen Gilliss noted that this is just the introduction and is not intended to be a treatise on green buildings and all the things that that might mean.
- D. Chris Parts noted that Environmental Literacy requirements should be mentioned as Maryland is the only state that has them.
- E. Prescott mentioned that the industry has refocused on materials and life cycle. Tom agreed that the statement should reflect on LEED V4 and its emphasis on materials and life cycle.
- F. Prescott then returned to energy and noted the last 20% is the toughest. There are other places to shoot higher such as the Governor's Association's 2030 program which aims for Net Zero by 2030. This is code in some foreign countries and is not re-inventing the wheel. Tom noted that we looked at net zero schools last month. He noted that Secretary Collins had recently spoken to him about challenging DGS and bringing more challenges to the Governor.
- G. David Lever noted there is still a codes issue. The Council can help local jurisdictions with learning the green code.
 1. Tom noted that the Program currently applies to buildings over 7,500 gsf and schools. Should we be looking to expand that using the code? Now that it is adopted and embraced could the code be applied to other partially State funded buildings not currently covered? Need to discuss with DGS and the Administration.
 2. David noted that renovation of schools is a big part of what gets done and the program doesn't apply to that at this time either (it only applies to new and replacement schools).
 3. Tom noted that 7 years ago there was just one LEED but now there are multiple LEEDs for schools, interiors, envelope etc. We need to look at these for flexibility to do other things.
- H. Tom asked if we are doing green cleaning.
 1. Lauren noted that the Green Purchasing Council is working on green products and janitorial services. There are some challenges with some traditional State preferred providers but change is happening.
 2. Tom asked if the Council could participate in this. Lauren responded that we could provide some specifics that would be in sync with LEED and IgCC. Joan Cadden said that State agencies are part of the green procurement group and that Secretary Collins would probably like to see a Council member attend in addition to Steve Gilliss.
 3. Stephen noted that the Green Building Program already calls for green cleaning and green maintenance; we just haven't had the resources to police it. So it would be good to tie in.

4. Chris Parts stated that 86 schools have green cleaning recommendations.
 5. Jan Cadden said there is a tab on the procurement site for Buying Green.
 6. Mimi asked if we could have a presentation from DGS on green cleaning. Lorraine Doo said that they have a program on green cleaning that could be offered to the council and to other state agencies. The Green Cleaning program is one of our programs in the next few months.
- I. Tom said that after June 2015, new projects will not be able to register with LEED 2009; they will have to register to use LEED Version 4. Any projects currently still underway and using LEED 2009 will be allowed to continue until complete. The Council will then have V4 which is more intense and has stricter requirements. We will need to focus on V4 and then look again at its effects on the IgCC. We can also look at the applicability of other LEED rating systems (such as LEED for Schools) as well as CHPS and the Living Buildings Challenge as alternative compliance paths. Joan Cadden noted that legislation is due the day after Labor Day, so any proposed legislation should go to the Secretary by the first of July.
 - J. Tom Liebel asked how much reporting is being done on the buildings built including the buildings not required to comply but which should still have green features. Stephen replied not much as there is no staff to follow up and enforce what's in the plan.
 1. Lisa suggested requirements could be set as performance goals for all Maryland buildings, regardless of rating system, such as a percentage of energy or water savings over a certain baseline.
 2. Tom asked how we inform A/Es to do this. Do we want to do this for a small DNR cabin? Stephen Gilliss said we could put together some green standards to put in our design manuals.
 3. Meg Andrews said they have some green standards. Mark Beck said the University has requirements too. We need to try to have the building agencies have consistent documents to include these features.
 4. Stephen said we need to get the different building agencies together. Mark said that even within agencies there are multiple groups that need to share.
 5. Tom said that minimum awareness has to be developed so that minimum requirements can be developed and we can encourage goals. Groups are not engaging with each other
 6. Lauren noted that energy coordination is better than ever. They are making more connections than ever with energy planning coordinators. Tom asked how we can bring this to green buildings. David St. Jean said persistence is important. Lauren said that StateStat asked about energy coordinators and their job descriptions.
 7. Mark said USM has a sustainability office with a Director and staff and interns etc. MDGBC is more nebulous. How can we get more information out there about what we do? Maybe hold a statewide meeting. David Lever agrees we could use a forum to create excitement and persistence. Mark said they've been having some of these in house but haven't broadcast to all. Ellen Robertson agreed that outreach is important. Getting the

council name out there and gathering people together is good. David St. Jean agrees. We could even get different states together to learn from each other.

8. David Lever imagined what we could do with more staff. Tom said we've talked before about more money and more staff. What are the logistic of creating more positions? Mimi suggested Tom approach this with the Secretary.
9. Tom implied that we could have more green buildings with more staff. Lauren corrected that implication. DGS doesn't create projects. The projects come from a large capital budget. There are lots of other project managers handling other LEED projects so the number of projects is not limited by Council staff. Tom agreed but still says we have a limited capacity to do the things the Council wants to do.

IV. The next agenda item was a discussion led by Stephen Gilliss on how to complete the IgCC supplement

- A. The law goes into effect October 1, 2014. Tom said he would like to see a draft by July to go out for comment. Then we could discuss in the July meeting.
- B. Stephen said that he thinks the best way to get this done is to assemble a small work group to have some actual working sessions. He has already approached Mark Beck and David St. Jean and has them on board. He asked Lisa and Christine if they would participate to round out the committee with both the professional side and the public member side. They agreed. Stephen also noted that he is meeting David Lever to discuss his concerns for the implementation.
- C. Completed draft would be ready hopefully August 1 so that the Council could vote in August or September and then get to the Secretaries for their approval.
- D. David Lever said it would be nice to have IgCC in play for the public school CIP to be submitted in October.
- E. Tom said that he would like to see the Council supplements included in the whole code text. Stephen said that task would be impractical and take a great deal more work. For practicality the intent is to write a supplement and keep it as simple as possible. It would also make future supplements easier to edit. Also not sure that a Version of the code in Word is available.
- F. Stephen also noted that we did not get any of the implementation issues resolved today. If anyone has comments please send them. Otherwise the committee will also take a stab at the implementation (High Performance Building Program). Or we can move further into it at next month's meeting.
- G. Tom sad we need to get the IgCC done then work on the aspirational items. Meg asked if we are legislating expansion of Council purview. Tom said we already have expanded powers to promote green building in the State as legislated in 2009.
- G. Lorraine Doo asked if environmental resilience is under the Council as USGBCMD is starting to look at it. Lauren said other agencies are handling that. Sea rise legislation was also approved this past Session.

V. Once Around the Table

- A. David St. Jean said he and Lauren are going to the National Governor's Association Energy Learning Lab in Minneapolis in June.
- B. David also said they have a DOE Grant for free energy audits for commercial buildings up to 20,000 sf.

C. MEA and DGS are trying to arrange a DOE sponsored “re-tuning” session for State facility managers this summer. Mark Beck and Susan Corry of USM are helping to find an appropriate building to monitor and hold the training session. MEA is engaged in several IECC compliance activities this year. We are:

- Testing compliance rates in Howard and Anne Arundel Counties
- Holding 6-8 onsite training sessions throughout the State on building science and the IECC
- Hosting an “energy Code Coach” to answer compliance questions.

D. Prescott Gaylord said his firm is providing Passive Home training May 14- 16 for builders.

E. David Lever said that the Children’s Environmental Health and Protection Advisory Council (CEHPAC) will assist the PSCP in drafting regulations on IAQ in relocatable classrooms; CEHPAC has information about other sources on VOCs besides the IgCC.

VI. The meeting was adjourned at 12:10PM. The next meeting is scheduled for May 28, 2014 at 10 AM. Hopefully at the Lowe House Office Building. Location to be confirmed

The preceding is intended as a summary only of the discussions held on this meeting date. Council members are requested to review the summary and notify the writer of any errors, omissions or unintended misrepresentations of the discussion.